



UNIVERSITI PUTRA MALAYSIA

**EFFECTS OF FOREST HARVESTING OPERATIONS ON
SUSPENDED SEDIMENT AND SOLUTE LOADS IN THE SUNGAI
WENG EXPERIMENTAL WATERSHEDS, KEDAH, PENINSULAR
MALAYSIA**

INTHAVY AKKHARATH.

FH 2005 1



**EFFECTS OF FOREST HARVESTING OPERATIONS ON SUSPENDED
SEDIMENT AND SOLUTE LOADS IN THE SUNGAI WENG
EXPERIMENTAL WATERSHEDS, KEDAH, PENINSULAR MALAYSIA**

By

INTHAVY AKKHARATH

**Thesis Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies, Universiti Putra Malaysia,
in Fulfilment of the Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy.**

August 2005



SPECIAL DEDICATION

**TO MY BE LOVED WIFE, SISONGKHAM AND OUR CHILDREN
KITTIPHANH, THANTHIVA AKKHARATH AND TO MY PARENTS, MR
LEOKHAM AND MRS SOMSY AKKHARATH, WHO LAID MY ACADEMIC
CAREER FOUNDATION AND TO ALL OF THE AKKHARATH FAMILY
MEMBERS FOR THEIR CONSTANT MORAL SUPPORT AND
INSPIRATIONS.
GOD BLESSES THEM ALL!**



Abstract of thesis presented to the Senate of Universiti Putra Malaysia in fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

**EFFECTS OF FOREST HARVESTING OPERATIONS ON SUSPENDED
SEDIMENT AND SOLUTE LOADS IN THE SUNGAI WENG
EXPERIMENTAL WATERSHEDS, KEDAH, PENINSULAR MALAYSIA**

By

INTHAVY AKKHARATH

August 2005

Chairman: Associate Professor Lai Food See, PhD

Faculty: Forestry

This study examines the effects of logging operations on sediment and solute yields in four steep catchments referred to as the Sungai Weng Experimental Watersheds located in Ulu Muda Forest Reserves Kedah, Peninsular Malaysia. Watershed 1 (W1) is a control catchment where logging was not allowed throughout the period of study. Watershed 2 (W2) was logged based on stringent guidelines as recommended by the Forestry Department hitherto referred to as reduced impact logging (RIL). Watershed 3 (W3) was logged based on conventional logging (CL) practices. Watershed 5 (W5) is a bigger watershed, where the experimental basins are nested within and selected to examine the downstream and cumulative effects of logging operations including in those areas worked previously.



The general aim of this study was to compare the relative impacts of CL and RIL on sediment output. In this study, the extent of sediment source areas in W2 and W3 in the form of roads, skid trails and log landings and their implication on sediment output was also examined. In W2, the logging roads density was 30 m/ha, while the density of skid trail was 68 m/ha and the exposed area was 43 ha, about 5% of total watershed area. In W3, the logging road density was 47 m/ha and the density of skid trail was 101m/ha; exposed area was 59 ha, about 9% of watershed area.

The most reliable and suitable method was chosen to determine the sediment yield of the four catchments was estimated using data assembled for the rising and falling discharge stages. In W1, suspended sediment concentrations are high during storms even though under natural forests. The peak concentrations sampled were between 1,278 to 1,896 mg/l from 1997 to 2002 respectively. The annual sediment yields were 160, 199, 148, 97, 79, and 80 t/km²/yr generated from 1997 to 2002 respectively.

During logging operations, in W2, the annual sediment yields significantly increased from 176 to 1,151 t/km²/yr in year 2000 and 2002 respectively. In W3, the sediment yields increased dramatically to 2,133; 5,386; 4,501 t/km²/yr over the period of 1998 to 2000 respectively. After logging ceased, sediment yield decreased to 869 and 684 t/km²/yr from 2001 and 2002 respectively. Sediment yield in W5 was much less even though, the sediment yields from the experimental watersheds W3, in particular was high. Depositions of sediment along the stream channel leading to the gauging



site of W5 and dilution from upstream channels were the main reason for the lower yield. Therefore, in W5 the sediment yield was contributing 143, 284, 829, 458, 178, and 163 t/km²/yr, in over the six-year period from 1997 to 2002 respectively.

Stream water quality was measured in each study watershed and the results revealed that solute loads were much lower than sediment loads. In W1, the annual solute yields were 12.5, 13.5, 20.1, 14.8, 13.7, and 13.8 t/km²/yr generated from 1997 to 2002 respectively. During logging operations, in W2, solute yields were 20.3, 13.4, 11.3 t/km²/yr, for the year 2000, 2001 and 2002, respectively. In W3, solute out put was 30.8, 27.0 and 20.0 t/km²/yr. However, the annual sediment yields appeared to have declined to 18.0 and 14.2 t/km²/yr, in the following two years 2001 and 2002, respectively. In W5, solute out put was contributing 17.5, 16.8, 27.0, 25.4, 23.1 and 17.3 t/km²/yr, in over the six-year period from 1997 to 2002.

The results of the study suggest that with proper control measures, the effects of logging on sediment loads in particular, can be substantially reduced. The increase of sediment yield in W2 to 1,151 t/km²/yr in 2002 with 80% the study watershed was logged suggests that RIL exerted significant influence on sediment output. With respect to pre-logging or control conditions, the analyses suggest that conventional logging can results in over 40 times the sediment yield during the logging operations. The positive effects of RIL can be achieved through careful planning, scheduling and control of logging operations.



Abstrak tesis yang dikemukakan kepada Senat Univeristi Putra Malaysia sebagai memenuhi keperluan untuk ijazah Doktor Falsafah

**KESAN-KESAN OPERASI PENUAIAN HUTAN KE ATAS MENDAPAN
MAMPAT DAN MUATAN BAHAN KIMIA DI KAWASAN KAJIAN
TADAHAN AIR SUNGAI WENG, KEDAH, SEMENANJUNG MALAYSIA.**

Oleh

INTHAVVY AKKHARATH

Ogos 2005

Pengerusi: Profesor Madya Lai Food See, PhD

Fakulti: Perhutanan

Kajian ini adalah untuk mengenalpasti kesan-kesan operasi pembalakan ke atas pemendapan mendapan di empat lokasi kawasan kajian tadahan air yang curam yang terletak di Hutan Simpan Ulu Muda, Kedah, Semenanjung Malaysia. Tadahan air 1 (W1) adalah sebagai tadahan air kawalan di mana pembalakan tidak dibenarkan sepanjang tempoh kajian. Tadahan air 2 (W2) adalah kawasan yang telah dibalak mengikut garis panduan yang ketat yang disyorkan oleh Jabatan Perhutanan iaitu mengurangkan kesan pembalakan (Reduced Impact Logging). Tadahan air 3 (W3) adalah kawasan dibalak berdasarkan kepada amalan pembalakan konvensional (Conventional logging). Tadahan air 5 (W5) adalah kawasan tadahan air yang besar, di mana lembah kajian yang dipilih dan diasingkan kepada beberapa bahagian untuk

mengkaji kesan-kesan hiliran dan kumulatif operasi pembalakan termasuk dalam kawasan yang telah dikerjakan sebelum ini.

Tujuan umum kajian ini adalah untuk membandingkan impak relatif (CL) dan (RIL) ke atas keluaran mendapan. Dalam kajian ini, perkembangan kawasan-kawasan sumber mendapan dalam W2 dan W3 dalam bentuk jalan utama, jalan penarik dan matau balak dan implikasinya keatas keluaran mendapan juga dikaji. Dalam W2, kepadatan jalan-jalan pembalakan adalah 30m/ha, manakala kepadatan jalan penarik adalah 68m/ha dan kawasan lapang terbuka adalah 43 ha, kira-kira 5% daripada keseluruhan kawasan tadahan. Dalam W3, kepadatan jalan pembalakan adalah 47m/ha dan kepadatan jalan penarik adalah 101m/ha, kawasan terdedah adalah 59 ha kira-kira 9% daripada kawasan tadahan.

Kaedah yang boleh dipercayai dan sesuai dipilih bagi menentukan hasil mendapan bagi keempat-empat tadahan air seterusnya dianggarkan dengan menggunakan data gabungan peringkat kenaikan dan kejatunan bahan buangan. Dalam W1, kepekatan mendapan adalah tinggi semasa ribut walaupun di hutan asli. Sampel yang mempunyai kepekatan puncak adalah 160, 199, 148, 97, 79 dan 80 t/km²/yr didapati daripada 1997 hingga 2002.

Semasa operasi pembalakan, dalam W2 hasil mendapan tahunan meningkat dengan Sangay bererti dari 176 ke 1,151 80 t/km²/tahun masing-masing pada tahun 2000 dan 2002. Dalam W3, hasil mendapan tahunan adalah meningkat secara mendadak

ke 2,133; 5,386; 4,501 80 t/km²/tahun iaitu masing-masing dalam jangka masa tahun 1998 dan 2000. Selepas pembalakan, hasil mendapan berkurangan dari 869 ke 684 80 t/km²/yr iaitu pada tahun 2001 dan 2002. Hasil mandapan di W5 adalah berkurangan walaupun hasil mendapan di kawasan kajian tadahan di W3 adalah tinggi. Pembuangan mendapan di sepanjang laluan air mengakibatkan kawasan 'gauging' di W5 dan pelarutan mendapan dari kawasan tadahan air atas adalah alasan utama menyebabkan kesan mendapan yang rendah. Walaubagaimanapun, di W5 hasil mendapan menyumbang sebanyak 143, 284, 829, 458, 178 dan 163 80 t/km²/yr dalam jangkamasa 6 tahun daripada tahun 1997 hingga 2002.

Keputusan kualiti air sungai diukur dalam setiap kajian tadahan air menunjukkan muatan bahan kimia adalah terlalu rendah daripada muatan mendapan. Di W1, penghasilan bahan kimia tahunan menyumbang kepada 12.5, 13.5, 20.1, 14.8, 13.7 dan 13.8 t/km²/tahun daripada tahun 1997 hingga 2002. Di W2, tiga tahun pertama sebelum operasi pembalakan, keluaran 'solute' adalah 18.6, 13.3, 28.5 t/km²/tahun untuk tahun 2000, 2001 dan 2002. Di W3, keluaran 'solute' adalah 30.8, 27.0 dan 20.0 80 t/km²/tahun pada dua tahun berikutnya pada tahun 2001 dan 2002. Di W5, keluaran 'solute' menyumbang kepada 17.5 16.8, 27.0, 25.4, 23.1 dan 17.3 80 t/km²/tahun dalam tempoh enam tahun iaitu dari 1997 hingga 2002.

Keputusan kajian mengesyorkan bahawa perlunya kawalan yang sempurna terutamanya bagi mengurangkan kesan mendapan akibat aktiviti pembalakan. Pertambahan hasil mendapan di W2 sehingga 1,151 t/km²/tahun dalam tahun 2002



dengan meliputi 80% kajian tadahan pembalakan menunjukkan RIL 'exerted' menyebabkan perbezaan yang bererti ke atas keluaran mendapan. Berdasarkan kepada keadaan sebelum pembalakan atau kawalan kajian, analisa mencadangkan pembalakan konvensional akan menghasilkan lebih 40 kali hasil mendapan semasa operasi pembalakan. Walaubagaimanapun, dalam peringkat yang tertentu, RIL boleh dicapai melalui perancangan yang berhati-hati, penjadualan dan kawalan operasi pembalakan.



ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

First of all I would like to express my heartfelt gratitude and appreciation to my supervisor, Assoc. Prof. Dr. Lai Food See for his invaluable help, dedicated efforts, guidance, suggestions and construction criticisms throughout this study. I am also very grateful indeed to my supervisory committee members Prof. Lee Chnong Kheng and Prof. Dato' Dr. Nik Muhamad Nik Ab Majid for their kind assistance, painstaking furnished countless invaluable comments and suggestions to improve this study. I am truly indebted to them. I also appreciate Mdam Choo Chai Syam for assisting in water chemistry analysis and my gratitude also goes to Mr. Albert Tan for providing digitized mads.

I would like to express my sincere thanks and appreciation to the Muda Agricultural Development Authority (MADA) for providing financial support. For these, I would like to express deep gratitude to all staff of special thanks Ir. Foong Kam Chong, Head of Engineering Division, Ir. Loh Kim Mon, Head of Planning and design section and Ir. Geh Yean Lian, Head of Dam management section. My thanks also to Mr. Zaim bin Abdul Rashid, Mohd Zuki bin Harun and Kharuldin bin Nai, Khairul Anas and Khairul Anwar bin Said for field work assistance and data collection during this study. I would like to thank Ir. Low Koon Sing of Drainage and Irrigation Department (DID) Ampang, Kuala Lumpur and his staff for their providing the discharge data and rainfall data for use in this study.



My sincere thanks are also due to various individuals; Mr Khampheuane Kingsada, Director General of Lao Forestry Department and Mr. Vongxay Norakham, Head of Forest Inventory and Planning section of Forestry Department in Vientiane, Laos for their provided me a study leave during my M.Sc and Ph.D. programmes. Profound appreciation and thanks are also extended to, Mr. Zahari Bin Ibrahim, Mr. Ariffin Abdu, Mr. Bounheuang Ninchaleune and Manichanh Sayavong for their love, encouragement, support and prayer. I love you all.

I am indebted to my parents, who gave support in my academic pursuit. My heartfelt thanks are extended to my brothers, sisters, and every member of my family for their undivided love throughout PhD programme. Lastly, my special and deepest thanks and love towards my wife, Sisongkham Chanthavong for her love, sacrifice, patience, support, and encouragement. My children, Kittiphanh and Thanthiva Akkharath, in their own ways have continuously provided me with love and inspiration. They patiently tolerated my preoccupation with my studies and work. My special love to them.



TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | | Page |
|------------------------------|--|-------------|
| DEDICATION | | i |
| ABSTRACT | | ii |
| ABSTRAK | | v |
| ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS | | ix |
| LIST OF TABLES | | xviii |
| LIST OF FIGURES | | xxi |
| LIST OF PLATES | | xxiv |
| LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS | | xxv |
| CHAPTER | | |
| I | INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| | General Background | 1 |
| | Statement of the Problems | 4 |
| | Objectives of the Study | 7 |
| | Study Approach | 8 |
| | Organisation of the Thesis | 9 |
| II | LITERATURE REVIEW | 10 |
| | Introduction | 10 |
| | Forest Logging Systems | 10 |
| | Monocyclic Logging | 11 |
| | Polycyclic Logging | 12 |
| | Reduced Impact Logging | 13 |
| | Pre-logging Planning; Contracts and Conditions | 15 |
| | Stream Buffer Strips | 16 |
| | Logging Road Construction | 18 |
| | Skid Trail Construction | 20 |
| | Log Landing Construction | 21 |
| | Sediment Sources and Transport | 24 |
| | Past and Present Research on Sediment Yield | |
| | in Tropical Catchments | 27 |
| | Experimental Catchments | 28 |
| | Suspended Sediment | 32 |
| | Solutes | 36 |
| | Summary | 39 |
| III | MATERIALS AND METHODS | 41 |
| | Introduction | 41 |
| | Location | 41 |



| | |
|--|------------|
| Watershed Characteristics | 43 |
| Catchment Physiography | 45 |
| Topography | 45 |
| Basin Slope Classification | 45 |
| Drainage | 46 |
| Climate | 47 |
| General Rainfall Pattern | 47 |
| Geology and Lithology | 49 |
| Soil Characteristics | 52 |
| Forest Type in Study Watersheds | 55 |
| Hydrological Characteristics | 57 |
| Rain Gauges | 57 |
| Rainfall Data Collection | 62 |
| Stream Flow Stations | 62 |
| Stream Gauging | 67 |
| Automatic Water Samplers | 67 |
| Laboratory Procedure in Suspended Sediment Separation | 71 |
| Analyses of Suspended Sediment and Filtrate Separation | 71 |
| Water Chemistry | 74 |
| Analysis of Water Chemistry | 75 |
| Treatment of the Study Catchments | 75 |
| Road Construction and Drainage | 77 |
| Skid Trail | 80 |
| Bridge Construction | 81 |
| Landing | 83 |
| Past Forestry Operations in W5 | 84 |
| Logging Phases in W2 and W3 | 84 |
| Statistical Approaches | 86 |
| Summary | 87 |
| | |
| IV | |
| SEDIMENT SOURCES; ROADS, SKID TRAILS AND LOG LANDING | 88 |
| Introduction | 88 |
| Characteristics of Roads, skid trails and landing in W2 and W3 | 88 |
| Distribution and Location of Roads, Skid trails and Landing for each Logging Block in W2 and W3 | 91 |
| Sediment Sources | 99 |
| Comparison with Forestry Guidelines | 103 |
| Summary | 105 |
| | |
| V | |
| SEDIMENT TRANSPORT AND YIELD | 108 |
| Introduction | 108 |
| Catchment hydrology | 108 |
| Stream Discharge | 114 |



| | |
|---|------------|
| Observations of suspended sediment Concentrations | 119 |
| Suspended Sediment Load Computation | 124 |
| Sediment Production Computation | 137 |
| Base-flow Separation | 138 |
| Suspended Sediment Transport during | |
| Period of Observations | 140 |
| W1 | 147 |
| W2 | 150 |
| W3 | 155 |
| W5 | 159 |
| Summary | 167 |
| VI STREAM WATER CHEMISTRY | 168 |
| Introduction | 168 |
| Stream water quality | 168 |
| Conductivity | 169 |
| Silica | 180 |
| Calcium | 189 |
| Potassium | 191 |
| Magnesium | 192 |
| Sodium | 194 |
| Iron and Aluminium | 195 |
| Storm variation | 198 |
| W1 | 199 |
| W2 and W3 Concentration Changes | |
| Resulting Logging operations | 203 |
| W5 | 214 |
| Summary | 218 |
| Solute Yields | 219 |
| W1 | 220 |
| W2 | 222 |
| W3 | 223 |
| W5 | 225 |
| Summary | 227 |
| VII DISCUSSION | 230 |
| Introduction | 230 |
| Suspended Load | 230 |
| Pre-logging | 231 |
| During Logging Operations | 234 |
| Post Logging | 236 |
| Comparison with Other Studies | 237 |
| Solute Load | 243 |
| Pre-logging | 243 |
| During Logging Operations | 248 |
| Post Logging | 250 |



| | |
|---|------------|
| Comparison with Other Studies | 251 |
| Summary | 253 |
| VIII CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION | 254 |
| Conclusion | 254 |
| Recommendation | 258 |
| Summary | 259 |
| BIBLIOGRAPHY | 260 |
| APPENDICES | 272 |
| BIODATA OF THE AUTHOR | 292 |



LIST OF TABLES

| Table | | Page |
|--------------|--|-------------|
| 1.1 | Permanent reserved forestland in peninsular Malaysia | 3 |
| 2.1 | Experimental catchment in Malaysia | 30 |
| 2.2 | Prescriptions for the supervised and unsupervised commercial logging in Berembun Experimental watershed | 31 |
| 2.3 | Sediment yields of selected catchments from tropical catchment | 33 |
| 2.4 | Solute loads of selective tropical catchments | 38 |
| 3.1 | Watershed characteristics of the Sg.Weng experimental watersheds | 43 |
| 3.2 | Slope classification of Sg.Weng experimental watersheds | 46 |
| 3.3 | Catchment location and proportion of productive forest in the experiment watershed | 55 |
| 3.4 | Type of rain gauge used in the study watersheds | 59 |
| 3.5 | Type of water-level recorders used in the study watersheds | 62 |
| 3.6 | Type of automatic water samplers used | 69 |
| 3.7 | Laboratory procedure for suspended sediment and filter separation | 73 |
| 3.8 | Logging prescriptions in the conventional logging and reduced impact logging catchments | 77 |
| 3.9 | Logging phases in compartments within study watersheds | 86 |
| 4.1 | Characteristic of roads, skid trails, and landing as determine from Topographic map and observation of watershed studies | 90 |
| 4.2 | W2, Roads, skid trails, and landings as determine from topographic map and observation of study blocks | 92 |
| 4.3 | W3, Roads, skid trails, and landings as determine from topographic map and observation of study blocks | 93 |



| | | |
|------|--|-----|
| 4.4 | Comparison of the construction and area exposure of roads and skid trails and landing with other studies | 104 |
| 4.5 | Particulars on logging operation in the study watersheds | 107 |
| 5.1 | Monthly rainfall and runoff data for study watersheds (mm) | 109 |
| 5.2 | Statistics of suspended sediment concentration (mg/l) | 120 |
| 5.3 | Summary of maximum suspended sediment concentration distribution in study watersheds | 121 |
| 5.4 | Statistics of suspended sediment concentration (mg/l) | 123 |
| 5.5 | W1, summary of values of rating curves | 127 |
| 5.6 | W2, summary of values of rating curves | 128 |
| 5.7 | W3, summary of values of rating curves | 130 |
| 5.8 | W5, summary of values of rating curves | 131 |
| 5.9 | W1, summary of suspended sediment load values | 143 |
| 5.10 | W2, summary of suspended sediment load values | 144 |
| 5.11 | W3, summary of suspended sediment load values | 145 |
| 5.12 | W5, summary of suspended sediment load values | 146 |
| 5.13 | W1, suspended sediment production (Method B) | 148 |
| 5.14 | W2, suspended sediment production (Method B) | 152 |
| 5.15 | W3, suspended sediment production (Method B) | 156 |
| 5.16 | W5, suspended sediment production (Method B) | 160 |
| 6.1 | W1, summary of stream water chemistry | 170 |
| 6.2 | W2, summary of stream water chemistry | 172 |
| 6.3 | W3, summary of stream water chemistry | 174 |
| 6.4 | W5, summary of stream water chemistry | 176 |



| | | |
|------|---|-----|
| 6.5 | W1, stream water chemistry for storm of 13-11-01 | 200 |
| 6.6 | W2, stream water chemistry for storm of 22-10-99 and 23-10-99 | 204 |
| 6.7 | W2, stream water chemistry for storm of 15-10-2001 | 208 |
| 6.8 | W3, stream water chemistry for storm of 23-05-1999 | 212 |
| 6.9 | W5, stream water chemistry for storm of 09-10-99 | 215 |
| 6.10 | W1, monthly loads of individual element (t/km ²) | 276 |
| 6.11 | W1, percentage of individual elemental for monthly loads to total monthly solute out put for respective months | 278 |
| 6.12 | W2, monthly loads of individual element (t/km ²) | 280 |
| 6.13 | W2, percentage of individual elemental for monthly loads to total monthly solute out put for respective months | 282 |
| 6.14 | W3, monthly loads of individual element (t/km ²) | 284 |
| 6.15 | W3, percentage of individual elemental for monthly loads to total monthly solute out put for respective months | 286 |
| 6.16 | W5, monthly loads of individual element (t/km ²) | 288 |
| 6.17 | W5, percentage of individual elemental for monthly loads to total monthly solute out put for respective months | 290 |
| 6.18 | Summary of solute yield estimation for watersheds (t/km ² /yr) | 228 |
| 7.1 | Level of significance of differences between suspended sediment loads of the catchment using ANOVA (1997-2002) | 232 |
| 7.2 | Sediment loads from selected catchments in tropical forest | 240 |
| 7.3 | Level of significance of differences between ions concentration (C) and monthly solute loads (MSL) of study catchment using ANOVA | 245 |
| 7.4 | Solute loads of selected tropical catchment (t/km ² /yr) | 252 |



LIST OF FIGURES

| Figure | | Page |
|---------------|---|-------------|
| 2.1 | Uphill and downhill log extractions | 22 |
| 3.1 | Location of the study site, Sg. Weng Experimental Watersheds | 42 |
| 3.2 | Layout of the Sg.Weng Experimental Watersheds | 44 |
| 3.3 | Mean monthly rainfall between Baling district and study watersheds from 1996 to 2002 | 48 |
| 3.4 | Location of the study watersheds and their surrounding geology | 50 |
| 3.5 | The legends of geology map | 51 |
| 3.6 | Soil series map in W1, W2 and W3 | 54 |
| 3.7 | Symington's (1943) altitudinal forest zones and elevation of study catchment in Peninsular Malaysia | 56 |
| 3.8 | Rain gauge and streamflow stations in the study watersheds | 58 |
| 3.9 | Forest compartments located in the study watershed | 85 |
| 4.1 | W2, Location and distribution of roads, skid trail, and landing on mapping | 97 |
| 4.2 | W3, Location and distribution of roads, skid trail, and landing on mapping | 98 |
| 5.1 | Rainfall and runoff relationship and distribution at W1 and W2 1997-2002 | 112 |
| 5.2 | Rainfall and runoff relationship and distribution at W3 and W5 1997-2002 | 113 |
| 5.3 | Stage discharge-rating curve at W1 and W2 | 115 |
| 5.4 | Stage discharge-rating curve at W3 and W5 | 116 |
| 5.5 | Mean monthly rainfall and mean monthly discharge for W1 and W2 from 1997 to 2002 | 117 |



| | | |
|------|---|-----|
| 5.6 | Mean monthly rainfall and mean monthly discharge for W3 and W5 from 1997 to 2002 | 118 |
| 5.7 | W1, Suspended sediment rating curves (1997-2002) | 132 |
| 5.8 | W2, Suspended sediment rating curves (1997-1999) | 133 |
| 5.9 | W2, Suspended sediment rating curves (2000-2002) | 134 |
| 5.10 | W3, Suspended sediment rating curves (1997-2002) | 135 |
| 5.11 | W5, Suspended sediment rating curves (1997-2002) | 135 |
| 5.12 | Baseflow separation | 139 |
| 5.13 | W1, monthly suspended sediment yield | 150 |
| 5.14 | W2, monthly suspended sediment yield | 154 |
| 5.15 | W3, monthly suspended sediment yield | 158 |
| 5.16 | W5, monthly suspended sediment yield | 162 |
| 5.17 | W1, W2; monthly suspended sediment yield and discharge | 164 |
| 5.18 | W3, W5; monthly suspended sediment yield and discharge | 165 |
| 6.1 | Overall mean conductivity with standard deviation during baseflow and stormflow in all study watersheds (1997-2002) | 178 |
| 6.2 | Overall mean element concentrations with standard deviation during baseflow and stormflow in W1(1997-2002) | 181 |
| 6.3 | Overall mean element concentrations with standard deviation during baseflow and stormflow in W2 (1997-2002) | 183 |
| 6.4 | Overall mean element concentrations with standard deviation during baseflow and stormflow in W3 (1997-2002) | 185 |
| 6.5 | Overall mean element concentrations with standard deviation during baseflow and stormflow in W5 (1997-2002) | 187 |
| 6.6 | W1, Behaviour of individual ion during storm runoff on 13-11-01 | 201 |
| 6.7 | W2, Behaviour of individual element during storm runoff of 22-10-99 to 23-10-99 | 206 |



| | | |
|------|---|-----|
| 6.8 | W2, Behaviour of individual element during storm runoff of 15-10-01 | 209 |
| 6.9 | W3, Behaviour of individual element during storm runoff of 23-05-99 | 213 |
| 6.10 | W5, Behaviour of individual element during storm runoff of 23-05-99 | 216 |

